DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 045 HE 003 489

AUTHOR	Chance, C. William; Youra, Daniel G.
TITLE	The Doctor of Arts Degree in Washington--An Attitudinal Survey.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Council on Higher Education, Olympia, Washington.
PUB DATE	May 72
NOTE	34p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *College Faculty; *Degrees (Titles); *Doctoral Degrees; *Higher Education; Professors; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Doctor of Arts Degree

ABSTRACT

Since its introduction in 1967, the Doctor of Arts degree has been a center of controversy. Billed as an alternative to highly specialized, research-oriented PhD programs, the DA is specifically designed to prepare persons for undergraduate college teaching. In order to determine the receptivity to such a degree, a questionnaire was distributed in December 1971 to a representative sample of potential employers in Washington colleges and universities. This report contains the results of the survey. It is a summary of attitudes of relevant departmental chairmen on a series of questions concerning their views of the DA degree. It is evident that, for the most part, chairmen are receptive to the proposed DA degree, but this receptivity is not consistent across all segments of Washington higher education. (Author/HS)

ED 066409

Council on Higher Education
State of Washington

The Doctor of Arts Degree in Washington — An Attitudinal Survey

May, 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 000 409

COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION
1972

Richard P. Wollenberg, Chairman
Marion E. Wilson, Vice-Chairman

Citizen Members

Richard Albrecht
Seattle

J. Scott Barton
Bellingham

Goodwin Chase
Tacoma

Mrs. David Gaiser
Spokane

Carlton Lewis
Tacoma

Mrs. Tad Wada
Seattle

Walter B. Williams
Seattle

Marion E. Wilson
Spokane

Richard P. Wollenberg
Longview

Educational Members

Dr. James E. Brooks, President
Central Washington State College

Dr. Charles J. Flora, President
Western Washington State College

Dr. Melvin Lindbloom, President
Green River Community College

Dr. Charles J. McCann, President
The Evergreen State College

Dr. David McKenna, President
Seattle Pacific College

Dr. Charles E. Odegaard, President
University of Washington

Dr. Emerson Shuck, President
Eastern Washington State College

Dr. Glenn Terrell, President
Washington State University

Mr. John Mundt, Director
State Board for Community College Education

The Very Rev. Richard Twohy, S.J.
President, Gonzaga University

Legislative Members

Senator Gordon Sandison

Senator George W. Scott

Representative Richard L. Smythe

Representative James McDermott

Executive Members

Richard Hemstad, Legal Assistant
Office of the Governor

John McCurry, Director
Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management

Staff

James M. Furman
Executive Coordinator

Dr. William Chance
Deputy Coordinator for Planning and Research

Denis J. Curry
Deputy Coordinator for Information Systems

E. Anne Winchester
Deputy Coordinator for Student Activity Information and Special Studies

Stephen J. Blair
Administrative Officer

Daniel G. Youra
Educational Planner

Carl C. Donovan
Educational Planner

ED 068045

THE DOCTOR OF ARTS DEGREE IN WASHINGTON -- AN ATTITUDINAL SURVEY

May, 1972

Research Staff:

C. William Chance, Ph.D., Project Officer

Daniel G. Youra

Council on Higher Education
Olympia, Washington 98504

Introduction

Since its introduction in 1967, the Doctor of Arts degree has been a center of controversy. Billed as an alternative to highly specialized, research-oriented PhD programs, the DA is specifically designed to prepare persons for undergraduate college teaching. However, because DA course requirements are broader, and the research emphasis is less than PhD program requirements, opponents are critical of the DA and state that it will prove no more successful than other alternatives to the PhD as the accepted credential for college teaching.

American higher education is divided on the issue. The DA degree has received the endorsements of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the Council of Graduate Schools, but the American Association of Colleges has recommended against its adoption. At the state level, in January, 1972, the Coordinating Board for the Texas College and University system officially assumed a negative stance on the DA degree.

Doctor of Arts programs have been implemented in a number of institutions, and are under consideration in others. This is so in this state, where a Doctor of Arts in Germanic Languages was initiated late in 1970 at the University of Washington. Both this institution and Washington State University have several Doctor of Arts programs in the developmental or internal review stages, and requests for Council on Higher Education action on some of them are likely to be transmitted in the near future.

Before such action can be taken, however, there is a need for additional information to resolve the conflicting assertions on the desirability and efficacy of the new degree and particularly for an assessment of employer receptivity to degree holders.

In recognition of this need, a Council questionnaire exploring such receptivity was distributed in December, 1971 to a representative sample of potential employers in Washington colleges and universities.

The Council of Graduate Schools' Statement on the Doctor of Arts Degree describes it as a program for the preparation of undergraduate teachers in the academic disciplines of the Arts and Sciences. Accordingly, chairmen of departments in the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences were polled. Chairmen, rather than presidents or administrative officials, were selected since they are most directly involved in the training and hiring of degree holders.

This report contains the results of the survey. It is a summary of attitudes of relevant departmental chairmen on a series of questions concerning their views of the DA degree.

It is now evident that, for the most part, chairmen are receptive to the proposed DA degree, but this receptivity is not consistent across all segments of Washington higher education. In capsule form, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Chairmen who consider the DA a more desirable route to the preparation of undergraduate college teachers outnumber those who favor the PhD two to one. However, approximately one-third see no appreciable difference between the two.

2. Approximately two-thirds state their willingness to hire, pay, and promote DA's on an equal basis with PhD's.

3. The community colleges and private four-year institutions form the locus of preference for the DA degree. Chairmen least favorably inclined to the DA tend to be from academic departments in the public universities and state colleges.

4. Responding university department chairmen, as a group, are not favorably disposed to the DA. Three-quarters prefer the PhD over the DA, none state a preference for the DA.

5. As a general rule, chairmen preferring the DA consider themselves more favorably disposed to it than their departmental faculties. Most believe their faculties consider the DA a less desirable degree than the PhD.

6. While a majority of the respondents indicate dissatisfaction with the PhD dissertation in its present form, most of this dissatisfaction is attributable to community college chairmen. When taken separately, a majority of the public four-year school chairmen express satisfaction with the PhD dissertation in its present form.

7. Most of the chairmen who would hire them would have DA's teach at all levels of the undergraduate curriculum.

8. There is a sufficient number of departmental chairmen willing to hire DA's to warrant a conclusion that employment opportunities would be open to them. Moreover, interest in the DA appears sufficiently great in the community colleges and private institutions to suggest that DA degree holders might have a preferential edge when competing with PhD's for positions in those sectors.

The Doctor of Arts Degree

The first Doctor of Arts degree program was established in 1967. The thrust of the program was and continues to be preparation for college teaching positions at the undergraduate level, primarily in the humanities and the social and natural sciences. The DA is an attempt to cope with a series of problems associated with the use of the PhD, essentially a "research-oriented" degree, as the basic credential for college teaching.

Doctor of Arts programs are practice-oriented. Their emphases are on pedagogical concerns, and they require completion of manageable dissertations contributing to (such matters as) the improvement of college teaching. They also entail internships involving college teaching in a supervised atmosphere for a substantial period of time.

Prior to the qualifying examinations (usually given at the end of the second year) requirements for the PhD and DA are about the same. The main difference to this point is the encouragement of DA students to enroll for some Education coursework and seek a greater variety of academic courses. After the qualifying examinations the differences become more pronounced: candidates for both degrees begin work on their dissertations. But for the aspiring PhD, the task involves preparation of a comparatively long and detailed study of a relatively specific topic aiming for the discovery of new knowledge; candidates for the DA, also commencing their dissertations, concern themselves with essays involving

less comprehensive studies of generally broader topics, again, preferably pedagogical in orientation. Analyses of teaching methods, the use of various media in teaching, review of teaching theories are examples of appropriate DA dissertation topics.

Upon completion of his one-year dissertation, the DA candidate enters a teaching internship (perhaps the order will be vice-versa). The PhD candidate, meanwhile, is still involved in his generally more complex and detailed dissertation. upon completion of these requirements, the DA would be qualified to teach at the undergraduate level in teaching-oriented institutions, including community colleges. The PhD's would continue to qualify for positions in the research-oriented universities.

The arguments for the DA are persuasive. Proponents see degree holders as particularly suited for teaching in academic programs in the community colleges because of their broad range of subject matter preparation and teaching-internship experience.

Opponents reveal a variety of reservations. One is the initiation of a new degree during a period of PhD surplus. They reveal particular concern that the PhD will remain the required degree at the larger universities. If the PhD remains the preferred credential, and if a college (because of the abundance of PhD's) can get a PhD for the same price as a DA, they feel that the PhD will be chosen. They further contend that the DA will be undermined as capable students are encouraged to pursue the PhD degree.

In the final analysis, the proof of the pudding must be in the tasting. Whether the DA will prove the answer to some of the vexing problems associated with college teaching cannot be determined at this time. Similarly, whether it will suffer in comparison with the PhD and finally follow the route of a variety of its lackluster alternatives remains to be seen. For the moment, a more pressing question relates to anticipated employment opportunities for the DA holder.

This study reports attitudes on such matters as preferred degree for teaching faculty, adequacy of current PhD programs, comparison of the two educational programs (PhD and DA), willingness to hire, pay, and promote DA's, teaching levels at which DA's would be employed, and related matters. The responses to the survey questions reveal variances in views, but they also indicate a generally receptive climate, at least in the community colleges and private institutions of this state.

Comments on the Sampling Technique

The survey centers on departmental chairmen and program coordinators, generally, those persons most directly involved, as hiring authorities, in the selection of faculty. The population surveyed includes all such persons in the humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and the natural sciences in the colleges and universities of this state.

For the purposes of the study, the institutions were segmented into four types: the public universities, the public four-year colleges, the community colleges, and the independent colleges and universities.

For the four-year schools, random samples were taken. The population in each type of institution was stratified to afford adequate representation for each of the three appropriate disciplinary fields (natural sciences, social sciences, humanities). For each type of institution, public universities, state colleges, and private institutions, the sample comprised 55 percent of the population, sufficiently large to ensure reliability and validity.

A different sampling technique was employed for the two-year community colleges because of their generally different organizational structures (not all community colleges have academic departments that correspond to the departmental structures of the four-year institutions). In this case, cluster sampling was utilized. This involved sampling the entire appropriate population in each of a representative number of colleges. With the assistance of the State Board

for Community College Education, twelve of the twenty-three colleges were selected as representative of the schools in this segment of Washington higher education. All of the appropriate chairmen in each were polled.

A total of 224 questionnaires were distributed (32 to the two public universities, 36 to the four state colleges, 63 to the 11 accredited private institutions, and 93 to the 12 designated community colleges).*

Questionnaires were distributed in two waves, the second occurring six weeks after the initial mailing (sent to those who had not yet responded). A total of 193 completed questionnaires were returned, producing a response rate of 86.2 percent. Response rates of each segment were the following:

Universities	96.6
State Colleges	88.9
Private Institutions	71.4
Community Colleges	91.4

In all cases the response rates are statistically significant, and it can be assumed that the results are generally indicative of attitudes among the population in each segment.

*In terms of total enrollments, the public four-year schools account for 39.2 percent, the private schools, 10.7 percent, and the community colleges, 50.1 percent (1971-72 figures). The samples do not accord with percentage of enrollments. Rather, they are a function of the population surveyed, in this case, departmental chairmen. Being more numerous, the private institutions provide a total population comparable to that of the combined four-year public institutions. For each segment the sample consists of slightly more than half of its total population.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was based on one developed and utilized by Professor Ralph Norman in his survey of college and university presidents in seven southwestern states (Professor Norman's study is discussed in detail in his report, "A Study of Some Attitudes Toward the Doctor of Arts Degree in the Southwest," University of New Mexico, September, 1971). The Council's questionnaire consisted of eighteen questions, some of which, with modifications, were taken from the Norman questionnaire. Two questions sought information on respondents' views of the desirability of the DA as a qualification for undergraduate teaching. Three questions centered on willingness to hire, pay, and promote on an equal basis with PhD's. Several questions related to which degree was preferred by chairmen and their views of which degree was preferred by their faculties. Questions involving envisaged teaching levels and projected mixes of doctoral faculty were also included. The remaining questions related to departmental characteristics. Finally, to ascertain some notion of their understanding of the DA, chairmen were asked to place themselves on a five-point scale ranging from "informed" (about the DA) to "uninformed." On this point, and following Professor Norman's lead, a short descriptive comparison of the DA and PhD programs was included in the mailing. This descriptive statement and the questionnaire appear at the end of this report.

In the following paragraphs the responses to individual questions are tabulated. When examining responses from the community colleges, recognize

that not all respondents are department chairmen: some are division heads who, in many cases, may be deans. All of these people, however, are directly involved in the hiring process, and their comments are relevant to the study.*

a. Respondents' Familiarity of the Doctor of Arts Degree

Departmental chairmen in Washington institutions generally consider themselves informed on the Doctor of Arts degree. They were asked, "In terms of familiarity with the proposed Doctor of Arts degree, where would you place yourself on the following scale?" The scale provided five choices: "well informed," "informed," "general understanding," "some understanding," and "uninformed." Responses were organized into three categories for tabulation, "well informed," "general understanding," and "uninformed." Their distribution is evident in the following table:

* In the discussion, respondents are sometimes referred to as "chairmen." In all cases, community college respondents, some of whom are technically not chairmen, are included.

Table I: Familiarity With The Proposed DA Degree*

	Well Informed	General Understanding	Uninformed	
Public Universities	83.9%	16.1%	0.0%	100%
State Colleges	71.9%	21.9%	6.2%	100%
Independent Institutions	55.5%	28.9%	15.6%	100%
Community Colleges	40.0%	43.5%	16.5%	100%

Perhaps the only potentially unsettling conclusion to be drawn from these responses is the comparatively low rates of familiarity revealed by respondents from the community colleges and private institutions. In terms of percentages, those considering themselves well informed in the community colleges are less than half those in the universities. In the private schools the percentages are higher but are still considerably below those of the public four-year schools.

Given the obvious relationship between the DA and the community colleges and private schools, a continued need to inform community college personnel of the nature of this degree program seems apparent.

b. The DA and PhD Compared

A plurality of respondents (42.5 percent) view the DA as more desirable than the PhD as a qualification for undergraduate teaching. Most of this

*Percentages on this and the following tables are based on responses to the subject question. They do not include those who returned their questionnaire but did not respond to the particular question.

favorability is attributable to community college respondents. Respondents in the four-year public schools are generally less enthusiastic.

Two questions were directed to comparisons of the two degrees. The first asked for the personal preferences of the chairmen, the second asked chairmen to state their perceptions of how faculty members of their departments view the two degrees.

In both cases, respondents from the community colleges indicate the most positive inclinations to the DA.

Question: Compared to the PhD degree, how do you (Departmental Chairman) view the DA degree as a desirable qualification for an undergraduate teacher?

TABLE II

	More Desirable	About The Same	Less Desirable	
Public Universities	34.5%	27.6%	37.9%	100%
State Colleges	21.9%	34.4%	43.8%	100%
Independent Institutions	36.4%	47.7%	15.9%	100%
Community Colleges	56.6%	36.1%	7.2%	100%
TOTAL	(42.5%)	(37.2%)	(20.2%)	100%

There is some distinction between the preferences of the community college and private institution respondents and those of the state colleges and public universities. While a large percentage of the chairmen in the former indicate

preferences for the DA, the largest single groupings in the state colleges and universities see it as the least desirable of the two. This pattern may indicate a tendency for university chairmen to perceive departmental roles in terms of research: preference for the PhD would accord with such an orientation. Similarly, state college department chairmen, facing heavy undergraduate teaching responsibilities, while perhaps attempting to build a recognized graduate program, might also logically consider the PhD the more desirable degree.

Department chairmen generally consider their faculties less favorably disposed to the DA than they. Less than one-third (27.5 percent) indicate a belief that their faculties see the DA as more desirable than the PhD. This may be compared with the aforementioned 42.5 percent who state their personal preference for the degree.

Question: In terms of desirability, how do you suppose the faculty in your department perceive the DA degree?

TABLE III

	More Desirable	About The Same	Less Desirable	
Public Universities	14.3%	17.9%	67.9%	100%
State Colleges	6.5%	41.9%	51.6%	100%
Independent Institutions	19.1%	50.0%	30.6%	100%
Community Colleges	44.4%	43.2%	12.4%	100%
TOTAL	(27.5%)	(40.7%)	(31.9%)	100%

As before, negative images of the DA are most directly attributable to the public four-year schools, and this is probably for the same reasons mentioned earlier. Another explanation may lie in the presence of PhDs on these faculties and a feeling among chairmen that faculty are resistent to indirect attacks on their own qualifications. Accordingly, the comparatively lesser numbers of PhD's among community college teachers may account for lack of perceived resistance to the DA among faculties in this sector.

In an effort to identify causes of resistance to or support for the DA, the questionnaire sought elaboration on these responses. Specifically, chairmen were asked to state their reasons for preferring one degree over the other. The results are inconclusive since not many chose to express themselves (33 percent responded).

The two most commonly cited reasons of proponents were the DA's teaching orientation and the breadth of subject matter preparation. A few statements referred to different dissertation requirements as reasons for preferring the degree. Examples of favorable statements are, "The emphasis in the community colleges is in breadth, not depth," and, "Absurd overspecialization is not desirable in a teacher."

Of the respondents favoring the PhD, many stated that proposed DA degree programs fail to give sufficient emphasis to the development of research capabilities. Statements such as the following were common: "Good teaching goes

hand-in-glove with good research and good research with good writing." "The DA degree places too much emphasis on teaching and not enough on scholarship."

At this point it is evident that chairmen in the community colleges, in particular, look with favor on the DA degree. Much of this seems attributable to the broader educational programs embraced by the degree and program requirements for teaching education. Part may also relate to the comparatively less intensive dissertation requirements. To assess attitudes on this issue, chairmen were asked to relate to the PhD dissertation as a qualification for undergraduate teaching.

c. The PhD Dissertation

While slightly more than a third of the respondents state that the PhD dissertation is a desirable qualification for undergraduate college teaching, more than half (55.3 percent) indicate dissatisfaction. Most of the dissatisfaction occurs among chairmen in the community colleges where more than 70 percent report negative views of the PhD dissertation as a teaching qualification. Chairmen in the private institutions respond similarly, although the distribution is less dramatic (52.5 percent negative, 47.5 percent positive). Contrasting with these patterns, negative views of the PhD dissertation measure 32 percent in both the public university and state college segments: the majority of chairmen in both public four-year segments view the PhD dissertation in a positive light.

Question: In your opinion, is the PhD dissertation in its present from a desirable qualification for an undergraduate college teacher?

TABLE IV

	Yes	No	No Opinion	
Public Universities	57.1%	32.1%	10.7%	100%
State Colleges	54.8%	32.3%	12.9%	100%
Independent Institutions	47.5%	52.5%	0.0%	100%
Community Colleges	14.6%	73.2%	12.2%	100%
TOTAL	(35.4%)	(55.3%)	(9.4%)	100%

These findings may lend some substance to the belief that the PhD dissertation is a major source of concern among those seeking alternatives to the degree. The shift in emphasis from research to teaching in the preparation of faculty for teaching-oriented institutions appears to meet with the approval of chairmen in such schools.

d. Willingness to Hire, Pay, and Promote DA's

Three questions were directed to the willingness of chairmen to hire, pay, and promote DA's on an equal basis with PhD's. A majority responded affirmatively in all three cases. With regard to hiring, 64.4 percent state they would hire holders of the two degrees equally. A higher percentage, 69.8 percent, indicates they would pay them on the same basis, and a still higher percentage, 71.4 percent, states a willingness to so promote DA's. With respect to 'equal hiring,'

a majority in the public universities responded negatively. But after hiring, when questions of pay and promotion are involved, this negativeness diminishes.

Question: Would you be willing to hire a DA degree holder on an equal basis with a PhD degree holder?

TABLE V

	Yes	No	Do Not Know	
Public Universities	30.0%	63.3%	6.7%	100%
State Colleges	56.3%	28.1%	15.6%	100%
Independent Institutions	63.6%	15.9%	20.5%	100%
Community Colleges	80.0%	1.2%	18.8%	100%
TOTAL	(64.4%)	(18.9%)	(16.8%)	100%

The community college (80 percent) and the private institution (63.6 percent) chairmen indicate the greatest willingness to hire DA's and PhD's equally. State college chairmen respond similarly, although the percentage is lower, (56.3 percent).

The affirmative response patterns continue when willingness to pay the two degree holders equally is assessed.

Question: Would you be willing to pay a DA degree holder on an equal basis with PhD degree holders?

TABLE VI

	Yes	No	Do Not Know	
Public Universities	50.0%	40.0%	10.0%	100%
State Colleges	62.5%	25.0%	12.5%	100%
Independent Institutions	57.8%	20.0%	22.2%	100%
Community Colleges	85.9%	0.0%	14.1%	100%
TOTAL	(69.8%)	(15.1%)	(15.1%)	100%

Majorities or near majorities in all segments reveal willingness to pay DA's and PhD's equally: these include chairmen in the universities.

Community college respondents again indicate greatest receptivity to the DA, as almost 86 percent state their willingness to pay holders of the two degrees equally. No community college respondent stated an unwillingness on this point. Varying slightly from earlier patterns, a larger percentage of chairmen in the state colleges than in the private schools state such willingness. In all cases, however, attitudes are generally favorable.

The last question in this series involves willingness to promote holders of the two types of degrees equally.

Question: Would you be willing to promote a DA degree holder on an equal basis with a PhD degree holder?

TABLE VII

	Yes	No	Do Not Know	
Public Universities	50.0%	43.3%	6.7%	100%
State Colleges	62.5%	21.9%	15.6%	100%
Independent Institutions	65.9%	15.9%	18.8%	100%
Community Colleges	85.5%	0.0%	14.5%	100%
TOTAL	(71.4%)	(14.3%)	(14.3%)	100%

This question, similar in format to the two preceding questions, produced similar results.

Again, on the three questions the greatest degree of negativeness occurs as public university chairmen express their willingness (or unwillingness) to hire DA's on an equal basis with PhD's. This, accordingly, is the most problematical area. To probe this further, chairmen were directly asked which type of degree holder they would prefer when hiring new teaching faculty.

e. The Preferred Degree

Lending emphasis to earlier indicators of their preference, chairmen in the public universities state an overwhelming inclination to the PhD: three-fourths respond in this manner. No chairman in the public university sample indicated a preference for DA degree holders. A majority of chairmen in the state colleges sample respond similarly--also prefering the PhD. Community college

and private institution respondents, on the other hand, state preferences for the DA over the PhD. However, large portions in both of these segments reveal no preference (some in both the private institutions and community college samples resent the forced choice and indicate they would hire neither).

Question: When hiring new teaching faculty, which type of degree holder (DA or PhD) would you prefer?

TABLE VIII

	PhD	DA	No Preference	Neither	
Public Universities	75.9%	0.0%	24.1%	0.0%	100%
State Colleges	56.1%	3.2%	38.7%	0.0%	100%
Independent Institutions	27.5%	27.5%	42.5%	2.5%	100%
Community Colleges	2.5%	30.0%	55.0%	12.5%	100%
TOTAL	(29.4%)	(20.0%)	(44.4%)	(6.1%)	100%

The high percentage of chairmen indicating no preference was unexpected. Such responses may be disquieting to those seeking evidence of an unqualified acceptance for the DA in this survey. Such views may serve as further evidence of a need to communicate with community college faculty on the subject of the DA degree.

f. Doctoral Faculty Mix

Chairmen were asked to identify a desirable mix of DA's and PhD's in their doctoral faculty. Since the question asked for doctoral faculty mix, positions requiring other degrees were not included in the calculations.

The responses to this question were scattered, and one-third of the respondents chose not to answer at all; thus, the results are not comparable to other responses.

Briefly, about half who answered feel that a 50-50 mix of DA's and PhD's within the doctoral faculty would be appropriate. Slightly less than one-third (mostly in the public universities) state they would prefer less than ten percent DA's in their doctoral faculty. Slightly less than five percent, all from the private institutions and community colleges, favor the DA and state that a doctoral faculty consisting of all DA's is desirable. The remaining responses range between these extremes. Generally, the public university and state college respondents cluster at the PhD end of the spectrum, and the private college and community college respondents emphasize the presence of DA's.

g. Teaching Levels for DA's

To identify anticipated teaching responsibilities of DA's, a question concerning assigned teaching levels for those that would be hired was asked. A large part of the chairmen (82.1 percent) state that DA's would teach at all levels of undergraduate instruction (in the community colleges this would be the first two years).

Question: If you employed DA degree holders, at which undergraduate levels do you envisage them teaching?

TABLE IX

	First Year Only	First Two Years	First Three Years	All Four Years	Would Not Employ	
Public Universities	0.0%	13.8%	6.9%	51.7%	27.6%	100%
State Colleges	0.0%	9.6%	6.5%	45.8%	29.0%	100%
Independent Institutions	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	88.1%	7.1%	100%
Community Colleges	1.2%	71.6%	N/A	N/A	1.2%	100%
TOTAL	(0.6%)	(39.8%)	(3.7%)	(42.3%)	(12.8%)	100%

It seems evident that chairmen who would employ DA degree holders would assign them teaching responsibilities at all levels of four-year undergraduate teaching.

h. Acceptability by Discipline, Department Size, and Level of Awareness

Remaining questions concern such matters as department size, respondent's discipline, program levels, etc. Efforts to determine the existence of correlations among these variables and receptivity to the DA were made with the objective of defining more narrowly the most receptive market area for DA degree holders.

One such query centered on whether preferences of chairmen in the three relevant academic areas (natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, and humanities) differed. Although some differences were found, they were slight. For example, to a minor extent, chairmen in the natural sciences express greater preference for the DA than do respondents in the other two major disciplines.

(The percentages preferring the DA are: natural sciences, 23.6 percent, humanities, 16.7 percent, and social and behavioral sciences, 12 percent; respondents from all types of institutions are aggregated.)

Substantiating these patterns somewhat, a greater percentage of chairmen in the social and behavioral sciences (28 percent) view the DA as "less desirable than the PhD" than is the case with respondents in the other two disciplines (21.8 percent in the natural sciences and 16.7 percent in the humanities). Carrying this forward, of the three groups, chairmen in the social and behavioral sciences express the least willingness to hire, pay, and promote DA's equally with PhD's (though, again, differences are slight).

Hence, to a slight degree, chairmen of departments in the natural sciences are the most favorably disposed, as a group, to the DA. They are followed, in order, by chairmen in the humanities and social and behavioral sciences.

Various relationships between degree preference and 'institutional type' have been discussed. Generally, respondents from the public universities prefer the PhD over the DA degree. In the community colleges this pattern is reversed. Several other correlations with degree preference were also found. Two in particular were noted. Respondents in the larger academic departments tend to prefer the PhD, while those in the smaller departments reveal preferences for the DA. Similarly, a tendency for respondents classifying themselves as "well informed" on the DA to prefer the PhD was also found. For several reasons,

however, the relationships in these two cases are suspect.

The problem occurs as a result of the high correlations among institutional type, department size, and level of information on the DA degree. Briefly, the larger departments tend to be located in the public four-year universities and colleges. In addition, chairmen in these institutions tend to consider themselves informed on the DA degree with greater frequency then respondents in the other segments.

In both cases, however, these relationships were found to be spurious, i.e. their correlation with "degree preference" was a function of their high correlation with "institution type." By performing analyses that controlled for the effects of "institutional type," it was determined that no significant relationships exist between department size and degree preference nor between level of information and degree preference. In effect, institutional type accounts for the variance in respondents' attitudes on the subject of degree preference.

Conclusions

Evide of receptivity to DA degree holders is apparent. A clear majority favors the DA over the PhD as a credential for undergraduate teaching. Chairmen stating a preference for the DA also reveal willingness to hire, pay, and promote them on the same basis as PhD's.

The greatest support for DA degrees is in the community colleges and private institutions. Respondents from these sectors view DA programs enthusiastically and reveal strong interests in hiring recipients. The source of this enthusiasm (at least as suggested by written comments on the responses) appears to be the emphasis on teaching, rather than research, in DA programs.

Resistance to the DA is greatest among chairmen in the universities and, to a lesser extent, the state colleges. The reactions of university department chairmen were somewhat predictable, since their departments are those most likely to place an emphasis on research. Responses of state college chairmen, through perhaps less predictable, may also reveal a tendency to view their department's role in terms of research.

In both cases, however, four-year public school faculty negativeness to the DA cannot portend well for degree recipients. Logically, universities will assume the major responsibility for educating DA's. If their faculties fail to view them as comparable to the PhD in rigor and prestige, the likelihood of success of any DA program will be diminished.

APPENDIX

Council on Higher Education
State of Washington

Much recent discussion has centered on the proposed Doctor of Arts degree, a degree program designed to prepare students for careers in college teaching rather than research. The new degree concept has been approved by the Council of Graduate Schools and adopted by several universities in the United States.

The proposed D.A. programs differ from PhD programs in that the course selection typically will be broader within a particular discipline and there will be less stress on specialization. Course work in D.A. programs will include techniques of college teaching, educational psychology and other pedagogical matters. Requirements include a dissertation emphasizing original work (but not necessarily leading to the production of new knowledge), comprehensive examinations with stress on varied preparation, and a one-year internship in college teaching.

Since both the University of Washington and Washington State University are considering new degree programs leading to the Doctor of Arts, the Council on Higher Education is anxious to determine receptivity to the degree among Washington colleges and universities and the disciplines for which they deem it appropriate. Such information is of obvious importance to the long-range planning underlying these new degree programs.

To aid in the determination of these matters, the Council staff is polling the attitudes of department chairmen and program coordinators. Enclosed is a brief questionnaire and statement containing a few facts on the D.A. degree. You may keep the statement for your files, but please complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible, preferably before January 5, 1972.

Thank you for your assistance. The tabulated responses will be made public in a report and copies will be available on request.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel G. Youra
Educational Planner

DGY:k

Enclosures

Richard P. Wollenberg, *Chairman*
James M. Furman, *Executive Coordinator*

1020 East Fifth Street
Olympia, Washington 98504
206 753-2210 SCAN 234-2210

DIFFERENCES IN PREPARATION BETWEEN THE D.A. AND THE PhD[1]

Doctor of Arts	Doctor of Philosophy
1. Emphasis in graduate education is on breadth.	1. Emphasis in graduate education is on depth.
2. More varied course work in the student's discipline, also interdisciplinary study; stress on interrelationships or integration of disciplines.	2. Less varied course work with stress on specialization, largely in one branch of student's discipline. Auxiliary courses aimed at the specialty.
3. Course work should include techniques of college teaching, educational psychology and sociology; study of student personnel problems, etc.	3. Course work involving techniques of teaching, etc. is not stressed although students frequently teach under teaching assistantships.
4. Research experience oriented toward learning; dissertation, original work but not necessarily to produce new knowledge Develop an appreciation for research and the quality of evidence.	4. Research experience oriented strongly toward practice of research techniques with much emphasis on problem solving. Its aim is the production of new knowledge.
5. Works only on research problems which can be completed within one year on half-time basis or less.	5. Completion time of research largely dictated by nature of problem, although not indefinite.
6. Internship of about 1 year in college teaching required. Would not be met by usual teaching assistantships.	6. Internship in research. Length may be indeterminate.
7. Foreign language requirement and/or other appropriate research tool. (Foreign language requirement may itself be optional.)	7. Foreign language requirement and/or appropriate research tool.
8. Comprehensive examinations required, stress on varied preparation.	8. Comprehensive examinations required, stress on specialized area.
9. Highly developed support facilities not visualized as absolutely necessary in D.A. preparation.	9. Research emphasis requires presence of highly developed support facilities in PhD preparation.
10. Completion time--4 years or less.	10. Completion time--4 years.

[1] Statement adapted from Norman, Ralph D., A Study of Some Attitudes Toward the Doctor of Arts Degree in the Southwest, University of New Mexico, September, 1971.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE DOCTOR OF ARTS DEGREE

Name of Department (Program, Division): _____

Institution: _____

1. In terms of familiarity with the proposed Doctor of Arts degree, where would you place yourself on the following scale?

   a. Well Informed ☐ b. Informed ☐ c. General Understanding ☐

   d. Some Understanding ☐ e. Uninformed ☐

2. Does your department (program, division) generally require the doctorate degree for faculty?

   ☐ YES ☐ NO

3. In your opinion, is the PhD dissertation in its present form a desirable qualification for an undergraduate college teacher?

   ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ NO OPINION

4. Compared with the PhD degree, how do you view the D.A. degree as a desirable qualification for an undergraduate college teacher?

   a. More desirable than PhD ☐ b. About the same ☐ c. Less desirable ☐

5. In terms of such desirability, how do you suppose the faculty in your department perceive the D.A. degree?

   a. More desirable than PhD ☐ b. About the same ☐ c. Less desirable ☐

6. If in either No. 4 or No. 5 above you checked "Less desirable," please state what you feel are the reasons.

7. If in either No. 4 or No. 5 above you checked "More desirable than PhD," please state what you feel are the reasons.

8. Would you be willing to hire a D.A. degree holder on an equal basis with a PhD degree holder?

   ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ DO NOT KNOW

9. Would you be willing to pay a D.A. degree holder on an equal basis with a PhD degree holder?

   ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ DO NOT KNOW

10. Would you be willing to promote a D.A. degree holder on an equal basis with a PhD degree holder?

/__/ YES /__/ NO /__/ DO NOT KNOW

11. When hiring new teaching faculty, which type of degree holder would you prefer?

/__/ PhD /__/ D.A. /__/ NEITHER /__/ NO PREFERENCE

12. If you employed D.A. holders, at which undergraduate levels do you envisage them teaching?

a. Freshmen only /__/ b. Freshmen & Sophomores only /__/ c. First three years /__/

d. All four years /__/ e. Would not employ /__/

13. What do you feel would be the right percentage mix of doctoral faculty in your department (program, division)?

_____% D.A. PLUS _____% PhD EQUAL 100%

14. How many faculty are in your department (program, division)?_____

15. How many students are enrolled in your department (program, division)?

_____ Undergraduate _____ Graduate

16. Does your department (program, division) offer graduate level courses?

/__/ YES /__/ NO

17. Which degrees does your department (program, division) offer?

a. Associate or equivalent /__/ b. Bachelor or equivalent /__/ c. Master or equivalent /__/

d. PhD or equivalent /__/ e. Other (specify)_____

18. Additional Comments:

Please return the completed questionnaire to:

Daniel G. Youra
Educational Planner
Council on Higher Education
1020 East 5th
Olympia, Washington 98504